Athlete-centred coaching: An applied example from junior international field hockey

Don Vinson, University of Worcester

John Bell, England Hockey

1. Introduction

The extent to which the concept of athlete-centred coaching (Kidman, 2001, 2005; Kidman & Lombardo, 2010) has resonated with the international community has exceeded almost all other coaching discourse over the past decade (Nelson, Cushion, Potrac, & Groom, 2014). As well as featuring prominently in numerous academic coaching texts (e.g. Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2009; Gilbert, 2017; Light, 2017; Pill, 2018), athlete-centred coaching has also been embraced by a large number of National Governing Bodies (NGBs) both in the UK (e.g. England Hockey (Great Britain Hockey, 2015), England Rugby (Rugby Football Union, 2017), England Netball (England Netball, 2007) and the Football Association (The Football Association, 2015)) as well as in numerous other countries around the world including Canada, Finland and New Zealand - to name but a few (Romar, Sarén, & Hastie, 2016). Furthermore, athlete-centred coaching has also been espoused by some highly successful field hockey coaches (e.g. Ric Charlesworth (Light, 2013), Danny Kerry (Richardson, 2015) and Beth Anders (Gilbert, 2017)).

The appeal of athlete-centred coaching is easy to understand; at its simplest level, the term means putting the needs of the athlete at the forefront of the coaching process. Such an altruistic perspective has resonated strongly with coaches and few would argue with the noble intentions of practitioners espousing an athlete-centred approach (Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2017). Yet the application of an athlete-centred approach is far from straightforward. The purpose of this chapter is to explore some practical and theoretical challenges with applying an athlete-centred approach. To begin, we offer some reflections related to our attempts to be athlete-centred coaches emanating from our experience of coaching within the England Hockey U16s girls National Age Group (NAGs) programme. Our reflective narrative includes some practical examples of relatively simple and problem-feel applications of athlete-centred principles, some minor tensions which currently exist and will also outline some potentially more subtle challenges. We will then turn to the core theoretical principles underpinning an athlete-centred approach drawn from the literature, how these conceptions have evolved (or not) over the past decade and how the theoretical considerations might help explain some of our applied reflections. Finally, we will offer some suggestions and recommendations to those attempting to be athlete-centred coaches.

2. Athlete-centred coaching: Coach reflections

It is important to start by outlining the context of the NAGs environment as there are a number of factors we need to describe which inform our reflections below. The NAGs programme for U16s runs from September to July each year and features around 30 squad members who have been selected through the England Hockey Player Pathway (talent identification and development) activities. There are approximately 35 'contact' days per year, comprising around 12 training days with the remainder

dedicated to competition. The majority of the contact occurs after Easter each year with training days restricted to just one or two per month prior to that. Training activity usually features two to three day residential camps. The competitive matches are usually framed over a three-day series against one opposing team. Staffing for the programme comprises a Head Coach (John), Assistant Coach (Don), Goalkeeper Coach/Performance Analyst, Manager and Physiotherapist. The staff are employed on daily rates and so for all us, whilst these roles are incredibly important, they only represent a small part of our working lives. The programme is coordinated and administered by the full-time professional workforce of England Hockey. The budget to support the NAGs programme is tight and painstakingly balanced. If they are able, the girls are asked to make a partial contribution to the camps in order to sustain the maximum number of contact days possible across the year. For all the staff, it is an utter privilege to be involved with the NAGs programme and we are incredibly passionate about facilitating the best possible environment for the girls to develop. For the past two years we have used the strapline 'development and detail' as the overarching concept through which we hope to contribute to the ultimate goals of the NAGs programme which are to:

- Develop an oversupply of players for the [U18], U21 and Elite Development Programme (mainly U23) who have the potential to be world-leading senior internationals;
- Provide frequent, exceptionally high-quality, contact time;
- Provide exposure to junior international competition with a view to supporting and accelerating player development;
- Provide high quality education that effectively prepares young players for performance environments.

In addition to understanding the context of the NAGs environment, it is important to make the connections to the current broader focus of Great Britain Hockey. In 2015, Great Britain Hockey published the Golden Thread (see Figure 1) – a system to guide the delivery of all hockey coaching sessions in Great Britain from absolute beginners to the full-time centralised programme for elite international athletes housed at Bisham Abbey (the Golden Thread system therefore also applies to our NAGs environment). The five points of the diagram represent the things that all hockey coaching sessions should feature: (i) fun, (ii) loads of touches of the ball, (iii) (physical and mental) stretch, (iv) looks something like the game, and (v) constant decision making. To accompany the Golden Thread, Great Britain Hockey (2015) proposed that a games-centred (GCA) and question-led approach was the desirable model of coaching practice for hockey; England Hockey has been a strong proponent of these ideas with more recent emphasis on contextual and constraints-led approaches (see Renshaw, Davids, Shuttleworth, & Chow, 2009).

Figure 1: The Golden Thread (Great Britain Hockey, 2015)

To illustrate a practical application of these ideas, we offer the following practice as a typical activity which we have frequently used within the NAGs environment:

The overload/underload game:

- The purpose of the game is facilitate players' exploration of situations when they have a numerical advantage or disadvantage. We want them to explore how they might alter their collective attacking/defensive shape and priorities whilst adhering to the broader principles of play we have discussed throughout the programme (for example, to play 'forward, first, fast').

How the game works:

- The game is played across the width of half a hockey pitch complete with two full-sized scoring circles (16 yards) and a goal at each end.
- 7v7 plus a goalkeeper for each team (with at least one rolling substitute)

- Normal hockey rules are applied with the following modification:
    - If a team has a shot on target, wins a penalty corner or scores a goal, that team is allowed to deploy an eighth outfield player (to make 8v7)
        - 1 point is awarded for an action which gains an extra player
        - 3 points awarded for scoring a goal when 8v7 (scoring team has overload)
        - 5 points awarded for scoring a goal when 7v8 (scoring team has underload)

The game continues for the duration set by the coach – frequently in 3-4 periods of 6-8 minutes. We think this game comfortably meets the five elements of the Golden Thread. The intensity of the activity can be adjusted by altering the base number of players on the pitch (e.g. reducing to 6v6) and by the length of time of each period to ensure there is appropriate 'stretch' to the activity. The gaps between the periods of activities present opportunities for the coaches to ask questions. Often this questioning will involve a degree of collaborative strategizing to challenge each team to solve the problem of how they could be more successful as an attacking or defensive unit. This could also be a time for more individually-focused questions or some group Q&A – whatever best suits the purpose of the activity at that time for the particular athletes competing in the game. Our experience is that when games like this meet the five elements of the Golden Thread, the athletes are almost always keen to exchange ideas and offer potential solutions to the problem posed by the activity. To this point then, such GCA and questioning-based practices can comfortably be considered to be athlete-centred because they are commensurate with the approach originally outlined by Kidman (2001) discussed in detail within the theory section below. However, whether the athletes are then able to apply the ideas they have generated in the next period of play is less certain. Nonetheless, we are confident that through a GCA approach and appropriate questioning we have been able to generate a degree of athlete involvement in the learning process and this is what makes such coaching, at least to some degree, athlete-centred.

One of the most important mechanisms through which we seek to be athlete-centred coaches in the NAGs environment is through Individual Development Plans (IDPs); an online goal-setting document. The key principles underpinning the IDP are that the athletes take the responsibility for the completion of these documents and that each player is encouraged to consider as broad a range of developmental factors as they can (not just about technical and tactical aspects). We see this as a democratic educational device in that it represents a mechanism through which we can help the players develop in areas that they identify and, therefore, think are most important. Our job is to help them refine their initial drafts so that their goals are relevant, realistic and measurable. We do this through a series of one-to-one meetings at training camps and by comments that we will post through our online learning platform. The content of the IDP then shapes our individual discussions that we will have with each athlete before and after each competitive game. Table 1 shows a simplified (fictitious) example of what a player's IDP might look like.

Table 1: A fictitious and simplified example of an Individual Development Plan

Discipline	**Development area**	**Progress measure**	**What help do I need and who can help me?**
Hockey-specific	Helping the team get forward, first, fast.	Increase the percentages of my passes I play forwards	Video analysis with school and NAGs coaches
Set-piece	Be a more consistent penalty corner stopper	Increase the percentage of successful traps I make	Friends and team mates to practice with
Physical	Improve my acceleration	Improve by 5m and 10m sprint time	Working through NAGs S&C programme with school coach
Psychological	Being better at putting mistakes behind me	Not feeling like mistakes are negatively impacting my game	Encouragement from team mates
School work and examinations	Be better organised in terms of revision	Create, and stick to, a year-planner for revision	Help and advice from parents and teachers
Other	Continue to improve my Cello playing	Pass my Cello Level 5 and devote at least four hours per week to practice	Accountability from parents and Cello teacher

Whilst many of the principles surrounding the formation and refinement of the IDP documents represent an ideal fit as a democratic, educationally-focused, holistic tool, there are a number of challenges to their implementation will challenge us practically. For example, we have found real challenges with athlete readiness to participate in this process. U16s represent the youngest age group of international competition in field hockey in the UK. Therefore, the athletes we work with are mostly absolute novice junior international athletes. Whilst many of the athletes are ready to engage and have some experience of democratic educational approaches at school, there are always a small number who lack the necessary skills, especially early in the programme. Therefore, for a small number of athletes we end up providing many of the areas of focus and ideas about progress and so the document has much more of our 'voice' than we would ideally like. This kind of document will be a core feature of their international hockey experience all the way through to senior level. Despite these concerns, it is important to acknowledge that the IDP has been refined over a number of years to be the most practically useful document it can be with the athlete as the predominant focus. Therefore, whilst the IDP might not be perfect and has its limits, we believe it has an important part to play in the long-term development of the athletes.

Whilst we do everything we can to promote the most athlete-centred and developmental environment, it is unavoidable that the NAGs programmes are heavily influenced by selection. There is an inevitable, and incredibly strong, desire on behalf of the athletes to be selected, be part of the team and to represent their country as a junior international athlete. Furthermore, because of the budgetary constraints, there are actually very few contact days before we have to start selecting - which means we have not had as long as we would have liked to really get to know the athletes well.

This is further inhibited by our very part-time roles which mean we can only devote a very limited time to phone calls and contact via our online portal which otherwise might help us to deepen the coach-athlete relationship away from training camps. This frequent lack of depth in the coach-athlete relationship yields a number of concerns of us as coaches that might prevent us from being as authentically athlete-centred as we would like to be.

Another aspect which challenges us is the extent to which the selection-focus of the NAGs programme negatively influences our ability to be authentically athlete-centred in terms of the promotion of individuality and creativity; this applies to both our on-field and off-field practice. For example, we strongly promote on-field innovation and creativity in decision-making. Yet, it is clear through our one-on-one discussions, that the girls often perceive such 'risky' behaviour - which may result in a loss of possession or missed opportunity, as potentially damaging to their selection prospects. Furthermore, off the field, there are a number of rules and behaviours to which we introduce the girls because they will be apparent at every stage of their development through the system. These rules are set with good intent and, at one level, may seem relatively incidental – such as always carrying your water battle, always bringing a notebook and pen to meetings, what time to go to bed on camp. We have carefully considered the balance between the 'rules' we put in place and the degree of freedom we allow and we're fairly comfortable that we've pitched this as best as we can given the resources we have and that the girls have enough 'room' to be themselves. Nevertheless, it is possible that such common sense rules, sitting under the broader shadow of selection, contribute to quite a high degree of conformity within the group. Clearly there will always be rules and behaviours to which international athletes have to conform if they want to be a part of the system; we are comfortable with that, but it doesn't mean we are not challenged by it. It is a constant challenge to us to help them find ways to balance between conforming to the behaviours we would expect of an international athletes and encouraging their individuality and creativity - which we consider to be a fundamental part of an athlete-centred environment. It is important to stress that our approach changes each year as we make decisions on how to best facilitate an athlete-centred environment given the constraints of the system, our own beliefs and the particular needs of the athletes. Every coaching context is unique and so what athlete-centred coaching looks like in one environment, or for any individual athlete, will never look the same as for any other.

3. Athlete-centred coaching: The theory

This section provides an introduction into the theoretical aspects of athlete-centred coaching and how these have evolved in the literature over the past 20 years. Where possible, we have made connections to the practical reflections in the previous sections in order to better understand the challenges of contemporary athlete-centred coaching approaches.

Kidman's (2001, 2005) original conception of athlete-centred coaching focussed on the concept of empowerment. She argued that an empowered athlete was actively engaged in the construction of their sporting environment, making decisions about what to do and how it should be done (Kidman, 2005). In her early work, the predominant focus was on coaching at an episodic level – i.e. what happened within the training/practice environment. Cassidy et al. (2009) argued that an empowerment approach tackled some of the inherent problems arising from more linear, coach-led, approaches such as limited knowledge generation, a lack of cognitive involvement on behalf of the athletes, as well as participants' inhibited social development and creative problem solving ability.

Therefore, an empowered athlete was considered to be a better decision maker, an independent thinker and a more rounded human being – concepts which inevitably appealed to almost all coaches (Mills & Denison, 2013). Kidman (2005) offered some pedagogically-founded approaches to athlete-centred coaching, namely Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982) and questioning. TGfU is one of a number of games-centred pedagogic models including, for example, Game Sense (den Duyn, 1997) and Play Practice (Launder & Piltz, 2013). For the purposes of this chapter, we have used the umbrella term of GCA (Harvey & Jarrett, 2014) to represent all of these models. GCA-based research has commonly featured the term athlete-centred coaching as an over-arching term under which such models comfortable sit (Light & Evans, 2010; Renshaw, Chow, Davids, & Hammond, 2010). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to describe GCAs in detail; however, the main premise of such approaches is that by enabling participants to engage with game-like practice environments, which are representative of the 'main/full' game and which exaggerate a particular tactical or technical solution, athletes will ultimately become more effective games-players.

Kidman's (2005) second principle of questioning holds even broader appeal than TGfU as it can potentially relate to every coaching context and not merely those focussed on games. Research into coach behaviour has found that, through questioning, coaches often strongly lead athletes to the 'desired' response and frequently require such an immediate answer that athletes have insufficient time to think (Cope, Partington, Cushion, & Harvey, 2016). A more athlete-centred questioning approach encourages coaches to engage participants with strategically-focused questions aimed at developing higher order thinking skills such as analysing and creating, rather than 'merely' checking for understanding (Cope et al., 2016). There are several useful ideas available for coaches such as The Debate of Ideas, Goal – Reality – Options - Way Forward (GROW) and the Reflective Toss (see Harvey, Cope, & Jones, 2016). We find these basic principles of empowerment, GCA and question-led approaches to be relatively straightforward to apply within the NAGs environment.

Despite the widespread positivity surrounding athlete-centred coaching and empowerment, Nelson, Potrac, and Marshall (2010) were concerned about over-simplification and misrepresentation. Nelson et al. (2010) reported that athlete-centred coaching was being viewed as synonymous with a questioning approach; a position which they felt was in danger of undermining the potential of the approach to benefit the athletes. Nelson et al. (2014) cautioned that many coaches' intentions to deliver an athlete-centred approach yielded nothing more than an illusion of empowerment. Nelson et al.'s, (2014) position was influenced by their reading of Carl Rogers' contribution to Humanistic Psychology and is discussed in greater detail below. The interest in Carl Rogers emanated from Kidman and Lombardo's (2010) second edition of Kidman's (2005) earlier work which attempted to broaden the focus of athlete-centred coaching to even more prominently focus on the holistic development of the athlete. Kidman and Lombardo (2010) use the terms humanistic and athlete-centred coaching interchangeably, considering both to refer to the need to develop the 'whole' athlete. Kidman and Lombardo (2010) considered these 'whole' needs to include physical, cognitive, psychological, social and spiritual aspects. This latter focus on humanistic coaching has been considerably less pervasive than the earlier focus on empowerment. Cassidy (2010) argued that humanistic and athlete-centred practices are not synonymous and suggested that a simplistic understanding of the term 'holistic' could result in meaninglessness. However, recent texts appear to have retained the prominence of athlete-centred coaching but make no reference to Humanistic Psychology and either no (e.g. Gilbert, 2017; Pill, 2018), or nominal (e.g. Light, 2017), reference to holism.

Another principle which is worth examining at this stage is the extent to which coaching can be considered to be a principally educational endeavour (see Jones, 2006). It is through this educational

lens that Nelson et al. (2014) critiqued the potential contribution of Carl Rogers' theoretical contribution whilst prompting coaches to fundamental review their beliefs and values surrounding the broader purpose of coaching within their own contexts in order to establish the most appropriate approach to athlete-centredness. Carl Rogers was a psychological theorist who was committed to understanding the realisation of human potential through client-centred therapy (Rogers, 1951). Rogers' educationally-focused writings outlined the conditions through which human potential could be actualised through democratic principles i.e. a reduced emphasis on learning via direct instruction and a re-modelling of the educator as a facilitator (Nelson et al., 2014). Key to Nelson et al.'s (2014) argument was the belief that democratic principles are not appropriate to all environments and that a universal, 'one size fits all' approach to athlete-centred coaching is both inefficient and ineffective. Rogers (1951) suggested that where the goal of the encounter was to produce efficient technical performers who did not question the authority of the educator, then his proposed democratic principles were not appropriate. Furthermore, Rogers (1969) posited that those individuals not desiring the kinds of freedom enabled by democratic principles should not be forced to engage and suggested the educator might then adopt a more directive approach. Adopting a democratic coaching approach, requires therefore, a consideration of the wishes of the individual and also whether the goal of the environment is to produce athletes who:

> "…are able to take self-initiated action and to be responsible for those actions; who are capable of intelligent choice and self-direction; who are critical learners, able to evaluate the contributions made by others; who have acquired knowledge relevant to the solution of problems; who, even more importantly, are able to adapt flexibly and intelligently to new problem situations". (Rogers, 1951, p. 387)

If the goal of a coaching environment is commensurate with the principles outlined by Rogers (1951), then the challenge to coaches becomes how to ensure athletes are engaged in appropriate tasks in order to facilitate learning. According to Rogers (1969), appropriate environments to facilitate learning are experiential by nature, requiring personal involvement on the behalf of the athlete, are self-initiated, pervasive and are evaluated by the learner. Furthermore, the environments should be focused on something the athlete wants to learn and where the essence of the activity is 'meaning' itself. Whilst acknowledging the noble principles outlined by Rogers (1951, 1969), Nelson et al. (2014) questioned whether such altruistic notions were applicable in many coaching contexts, particularly those featuring a high degree of political control. A truly democratic environment would enable learners to help shape the technical areas of focus and tactical structures of the group. Within the NAGs environment, we are quite happy taking a pragmatic perspective on these issues and we are not convinced that this means we are guilty of misunderstanding or misrepresentation. Our perspective would be that we are implementing as democratic and as holistic a programme as we can facilitate within the constraints of the programme.

A further problem relates to the athletes' readiness to be empowered. Despite the prevalence of athlete-centred principles espoused within the literature over the past decade, studies of coaching behaviour have revealed that prescriptive, linear, practice remains the dominant mode (e.g. Partington, Cushion, & Harvey, 2013) – even in studies where the focus of the coach was reported to be holistic development and enhancing athletes' decision making capabilities (Partington & Cushion, 2013). Nelson et al. (2014) suggested that assuming a democratic approach was always the best and most appropriate environment to create for all athletes was, at best, problematic and fraught with difficulties. Nelson et al. (2014) highlighted that many groups of athletes were unlikely to have been exposed to many coaching environments in which they were genuinely empowered. This poses coaches a potential problem – if the athletes are not used to being empowered, are they going to be

able to deal with the freedoms they are going to be exposed to in a democratic approach? Despite such concerns, further coach behaviour studies have identified some appropriately constructed democratic environments in both youth (Vinson, Brady, Moreland, & Judge, 2016) and elite contexts (Croad & Vinson, 2018). These studies have revealed a utilisation of GCAs and extensive questioning, commensurate with an empowerment-focused athlete-centred approach (Kidman, 2005). However, neither the holistic focus nor the broader micro-political power relations evident within the environments were extensively problematized by the coaches featured within either of these investigations. We believe that part of the role of the skilful coach is to judge how best to offer the various freedoms with which we provide the athletes on as individual a level as we are able. For us this means we need to scaffold their learning in a bespoke manner and with different levels of freedom being granted to each individual.

Several recent articles have suggested that the micro-political power relations in coaching contexts could be better understood through the lens of social theory and, more specifically, the work of Michel Foucault (e.g. Denison et al., 2017; Denison, Pringle, Cassidy, & Hessian, 2015; Piper, Garratt, & Taylor, 2013). It is to this latter work that we now turn to illustrate how a number of contemporary coaching problems could be effectively framed and more critically problematized. Without denying that sports coaching is a pedagogic discipline, Denison et al. (2017) contended that acknowledging the centrality of the sociological power relations between coach and athletes could be an important tool in helping coaches to be more authentically athlete-centred. The principal concern highlighted within research viewed through a Foucauldian lens is that most coaching environments are founded on structures which make athletes subservient and through which they are pacified and controlled. Mills and Denison (2013) contend that this subservience, pacification and control is incredibly difficult, maybe even impossible, to tackle within our current sporting infrastructures. Going one step further, Denison et al. (2017) argued that coaches who assert that athlete empowerment can be facilitated through an athlete-centred coaching framework might even be limiting and constraining their participants – the exact opposite of their intent. Furthermore, without problematizing the nature of the coach-athlete power relations more deeply, coaches might be in danger of merely echoing and repeating dominant discourses which resultantly make athletes subservient, not empowered. In order to tackle some of the difficulties which Foucauldian researchers have highlighted concerning power in the coach-athlete relationship, it is important to outline some of the key concepts which underpin these challenges, namely disempowerment, discipline and docility. We will address each of these concepts in turn.

Disempowerment can arise from coaching practices which are very well-intended and which sometimes seek to embrace technological innovation. For example, Vinson, Morgan, Beeching, and Jones (2017) investigated the use of an online video-based platform which coaches engaged with in order to promote athlete autonomy through the medium of collaborative performance analysis. Vinson et al. (2017) found that the majority of athletes and coaches found such practices to be liberating to a degree, but also noted that most of the coaches were predominantly focused on ensuring their athletes arrived at a single, agreed, solution to any problem. Williams and Manley (2016) found even less freedom and autonomy within their case study of a professional rugby union club which utilised video analysis and a wide range of performance monitoring technology such as Global Position Satellite (GPS) systems. Williams and Manley (2016) concluded that the coaches' use of technological monitoring had enhanced players' perceptions of a controlling environment – this had led to enhanced conformity and a suspicion of how such technologies were being utilised. Foucault's (1977) contention was that many institutions, including prisons, schools and factories enforced and promoted discipline in order to make people more useful and productive. Similarly, the notion of sports teams promoting conformity through disciplined participation has long been established (see, for example, Parker, 2006). Mechanisms which promote conformity are often well-

intended and designed to promote empowerment. The result is to create groups of athletes who are docile – who actively seek not to be seen to deviate from the norm but conform to what they come to understand to be the behaviours of a 'good athlete' (Tsang, 2000). The warnings of these writings surrounding disempowerment, discipline and docility serve as a warning to us as NAGs coaches – we use them as part of the balancing process to ensure that we provide the best possible developmental environment within the constraints of the programme whilst maintaining sufficient 'space' for the athletes feel genuinely empowered and authentically individual.

Conclusions

Few people would question the positively-focussed and altruistic intent of coaches who want to be athlete-centred practitioners. There are also clearly a number of aspects of athlete-centredness, as we have illustrated in this chapter, which some coaches might be able to apply to their practice relatively unproblematically. However, there might also be other factors, beyond the scope of the coach, which might hinder their ability to be as authentically empowering as they would like. For us, the constraints of the programme and the inherent pressure of wanting to be selected for your country are factors beyond our control but that impact our practice. We would encourage practitioners who want to be athlete-centred coaches, to continue to strive to facilitate environments, which are as authentically empowering as possible within the constraints of their broader coaching context. We concur with Denison et al. (2017) that, as an industry, we need to more deeply problematize the concept of empowerment and investigate ways in which we can more authentically facilitate appropriate environments for our athletes. We also need further resources and support through coaches' learning communities to help each other to develop our practice as athlete-centred coaches.

4. Implications for practice

- Coaches should continue to facilitate as empowering and question-led approach as they are able;
- Coaches should embrace a pragmatic approach to adopting athlete-centred principles, acknowledging that these ideas will not be applied in a perfect, theoretically-pure, manner, but will require the careful consideration of what can best be done given the constraints of the environment. They should understand that every athlete-centred approach will look different to every other;
- Coaches should continue to strive to get to know their athletes on an individual level as deeply as they possibly can – this probably requires as much one-to-one time simply talking to the athletes about their lives and will help facilitate genuinely bespoke and holistic approaches to their coaching practice;
- Coaches should critically reflect on the constraints of their environment, which might serve to disempower the athlete or cause docility – addressing such factors as far as they are able.

5. References:

Bunker, D., & Thorpe, R. (1982). A model for the teaching of games in the secondary school. *Bulletin of Physical Education, 10*, 9-16.

Cassidy, T. (2010). Holism in sports coaching: Beyond humanistic psychology. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 5*(4), 439-447.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R. L., & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding Sports Coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice* (2nd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Cope, E., Partington, M., Cushion, C. J., & Harvey, S. (2016). An investigation of professional top-level youth football coaches' questioning practice. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 1-14.

Croad, A., & Vinson, D. (2018). Investigating games-centred pedagogies to enhance athlete decision making in elite coaching contexts. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 12*(1), 35-68.

den Duyn, N. (1997). *Game Sense: Developing thinking players*. Canberra: Australian Sports Commission.

Denison, J., Mills, J. P., & Konoval, T. (2017). Sports disciplinary legacy and the challenge of 'coaching differently'. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(6), 772-783.

Denison, J., Pringle, R., Cassidy, T., & Hessian, P. (2015). Informing coaches' practices: Towards an application of Foucault's ethics. *International Sport Coaching Journal, 2*(1), 72-76.

England Netball. (2007). *Netball UKCC Coach Education Programme Level 2 Coach Qualification*. Loughborough: England Netball.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Gilbert, W. (2017). *Coaching Better Every Season: A year-round system for athlete development and program success*. Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Great Britain Hockey. (2015). *Introduction to Coaching Hockey*. Bisham Abbey, Marlow: Great Britain Hockey.

Harvey, S., Cope, E., & Jones, R. (2016). Developing questioning in game-centred approaches. *Journal of Physical Eduction, Recreation and Dance, 87*(3), 28-35.

Harvey, S., & Jarrett, K. (2014). A review of the game-centred approaches to teaching and coaching literature since 2006. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 19*(3), 278-300.

Jones, R. L. (2006). How can educational concepts inform sports coaching? In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 3-13). London: Routledge.

Kidman, L. (2001). *Developing Decision Makers: An empowerment approach to coaching*. Christchurch, NZ: Innovative Print Communications.

Kidman, L. (2005). *Athlete-centred Coaching: Developing inspired and inspiring people*. Christchurch, NZ: Innovative Print Communications.

Kidman, L., & Lombardo, B. J. (2010). *Athlete-centred Coaching: Developing decision makers* (2nd ed.). Worcester: IPC Print Resources.

Launder, A., & Piltz, W. (2013). *Play Practice: Engaging and developing skilled players from beginner to elite* (2nd ed.). Leeds: Human Kinetics.

Light, R. L. (2013). *Game sense: Pedagogy for performance, participation and enjoyment*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Light, R. L. (2017). *Positive Pedagogy for Sport Coaching: Athlete-centred coaching for individual sports*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Light, R. L., & Evans, J. R. (2010). The impact of Game Sense pedagogy on Australian rugby coaches' practice: A question of pedagogy. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 15*(2), 103-115.

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2013). Coach Foucault: Problematizing endurance running coaches' practices. *Sports Coaching Review, 2*(2), 136-150.

Nelson, L. J., Cushion, C. J., Potrac, P., & Groom, R. (2014). Carl Rogers, learning and educational practice: Critical considerations and applications in sports coaching. *Sport, Education and Society, 19*(5), 513-531.

Nelson, L. J., Potrac, P., & Marshall, P. (2010). Holism in sports coaching: Beyond Humanistic Psychology - a commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 5*(4), 465-468.

Parker, A. (2006). Lifelong learning to labour: Apprenticeship, masculinity and communities of practice. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(5), 687-701.

Partington, M., & Cushion, C. (2013). An investigation of the practice activities and coaching behaviors of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 23*(3), 374-382.

Partington, M., Cushion, C., & Harvey, S. (2013). An investigation of the effect of athletes' age on the coaching behaviours of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Journal of Sports Sciences*.

Pill, S. (Ed.) (2018). *Perspectives on Athlete-Centred Coaching*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Piper, H., Garratt, D., & Taylor, B. (2013). Hands off! The practice and politics of touch in physical education and sports coaching. *Sport, Education and Society, 18*(5), 575-582.

Renshaw, I., Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., & Hammond, J. (2010). A constraints-led perspective to understanding skill acquisition and game play: a basis for integration of motor learning theory and physical education praxis? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 15*(2), 117-137.

Renshaw, I., Davids, K. W., Shuttleworth, R., & Chow, J. Y. (2009). Insights from ecological psychology and dynamical systems theory can underpin a philosophy of coaching. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 40*(4), 540-602.

Richardson, B. (2015, 8th December 2015). How high performance coach of the year Danny Kerry has put the Great into British hockey. Retrieved from https://www.connectedcoaches.org/spaces/10/welcome-and-general/blogs/general/181/how-high-performance-coach-of-the-year-danny-kerry-has-put-the-great-into-british-hockey

Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centred Therapy*. London: Constable and Robinson.

Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to Learn*.

Romar, J.-E., Sarén, J., & Hastie, P. (2016). Athlete-Centred coaching using the Sport Education model in youth soccer. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport, 16*(2), 380-391.

Rugby Football Union. (2017). *Codes of Conduct: Age grade rugby*. Twickenham: Rugby Football Union.

The Football Association. (2015). *Developing the developers*. Burton-upon-Trent: The Football Association.

Tsang, T. (2000). Let me tell you a story: A narrative exploration of identity in high-performance sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17*(1), 44-59.

Vinson, D., Brady, A., Moreland, B., & Judge, N. (2016). Exploring coach behaviours, session contexts and key stakeholder perceptions of non-linear coaching approaches in youth sport. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 11*(1), 54-68.

Vinson, D., Morgan, M., Beeching, K., & Jones, G. (2017). Collaborative evaluation of individual and team performance in training and match environments using the Coach Logic online platform. *International Sports Coaching Journal, 4*(1), 47-62.

Williams, S., & Manley, A. (2016). Elite coaching and the technocratic engineer: Thanking the boys at Microsoft! *Sport, Education and Society, 21*(6), 828-850.